

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending with claims 1 and 14 being independent in this application. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for suggesting allowable claim language. At this time, however, the Applicants would like the Examiner to consider the amended claims presented herein. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is kindly requested.

**SPECIFICATION**

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statements in the Office Action stating that the description portion of this application contains a computer program listing consisting of more than three hundred lines. The Examiner requests that the Applicants cancel the computer program listing appearing in the specification in Appendix II, pages 22-34, and substitute in its place a disk containing the same subject matter.

Applicants are attempting to comply with the Examiner's request.

Applicants note that Appendix I, pages 12-22 is not a part of the computer program listing and, therefore, does not have to be submitted on a disk.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims now render these rejections moot. For example, the claims now recite method steps that create

an object model architecture in order to respond to requests received by a client. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims now render these rejections moot. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102**

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,751,962 to Fanshier ("Fanshier"). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Fanshier fails to disclose or suggest the creation of a an object model architecture that comprises, among other things, the creation of a base framework object container interface and a base framework action container interface from base framework container interface objects in combination with other features, as in the claims of the present invention.

Instead, the Applicants submit that Fanshier appears to only disclose a command object and response object, not a base framework container interface object as in the claims of the present invention.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1-21.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number of the undersigned below.


In the event this Response does not place the present application in condition for allowance, applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 to schedule a personal interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



---

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JEC/ZBH:ame